

### **REMARKS**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 14-18, 20 and 26-30 are now present in this application. Claims 1-13, 19 and 21-25 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 14-18 and 30 have been amended. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

#### **Drawings Objections**

The drawings are objected to as not showing the arrangement recited in claims 21-23. By this Amendment, these claims are canceled and the need for drawing corrections is obviated.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. As noted above, claims 21-23 have been canceled.

Claims 14-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner specified certain phrases in claims 14-18 and 30 alleged to be unclear. These claims have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. The Examiner's assistance in this regard is acknowledged with appreciation. The bodies of claims 15 and 16 are now consistent with the preamble of claim 14.

The mooring devices secure the floating structure to the seabed and the floating structure comprises a surface element, columns and mooring lines. The attachments points can be on any of these elements and the term "floating structure" has not been changed to "surface element" when reference is made to the mooring devices.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 14-18, 20 and 26-30 are definite and clear. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner has not rejected the claims in view of the prior art. Therefore, it is believed that claims 14-18, 20 and 26-30 are now in condition for allowance.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner, either alone or in combination. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chris McDonald, Reg. No. 41,533 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.


Application No. 10/591,859  
Amendment dated May 5, 2009  
Reply to Office Action dated February 5, 2009

Docket No.: 1380-0229PUS1

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: May 5, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Paul C. Lewis *gm*  
Registration No.: 43,368  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant